



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,308	09/18/2006	Yvonne Heischkel	295788US0PCT	7530

22850 7590 05/21/2010
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/21/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/593,308	Applicant(s) HEISCHKEL ET AL.	
	Examiner /Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included cancellation of claims 21-35 and addition of new claims 36-49, filed on 02/16/2010, is made of record. Claims 36-49 are now pending. In view of applicants' response, all 112 rejections made in the previous office action have been rendered moot. However, the following new grounds of rejections as necessitated by the amendment are applied to currently pending claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 36-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Claim 36 and its dependent claims 37-49 are indefinite as it is not clear what is the structural makeup of the 1,3,5-triazine carbamate that is to be made by the process embraced in claim 36. As recited, the process of claim 36 states what starting material to be used but does not recite what triazine carbamate is to be made. Note triazine carbamate of formula II relates to starting material for the reaction. Without knowing what product is to be made and what its structural make-up one cannot practice the said process. Hence, claim 36 and its dependent claims fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
2. Recitation of "R⁴, R⁵ and R⁶ each independently of one another are the radical of an alcohol or amine," in claim 36 renders claim 36 and its dependent claims 37-49

Art Unit: 1624

indefinite as it is not clear what is intended. It is not clear what amine is being referred to and how the radical portion of the amine is different from the radical portion of alcohol.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 36-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for process for making triazine carbamate of undefined formula by reacting triazine carbamate of formula II, wherein Y^1 and Y^2 are $CO-O-R^4$ and $CO-O-R^5$ and R^4 , R^5 and R^6 each independently of one another are the radical of an alcohol, with an alcohol, does not reasonably provide enablement for process for making triazine carbamate of undefined formula by reacting triazine carbamate of formula II, wherein Y^1 and Y^2 are $CO-O-R^4$ and $CO-O-R^5$ and R^4 , R^5 and R^6 each independently of one another are the radical of an alcohol, with an amine as embraced in claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, following factors are considered. Note In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

Art Unit: 1624

1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:

The instant claim 36 is drawn to a process of making 1,3,5-triazine carbamate by reacting of 1,3,5-triazine carbamate of formula II with an alcohol, or an amine. Specification while enabled for making 1,3,5-triazine carbamate of formula II by reacting 1,3,5-triazine carbamate of formula II with an alcohol, is not enabled for process for making triazine carbamate of formula II by reacting triazine carbamate of formula II, with an amine.

As recited, the process implies that the reaction would occur leading to triazine cabarmate even when 1,3,5-triazine carbamate of formula II reacted with an amine for which there is no enabling disclosure. More specifically, in such cases the reaction would lead to replacement of, R^4-O , R^5-O and R^6-O with the amine thereby yielding a urea. Specification has no teaching or suggestion as to how to perform said process as embraced in the instant claims to arrive at 1,3,5-triazine carbamate.

2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:

Hence the process as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant is not an art-recognized process and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

3. The amount of direction or guidance present:

Examples illustrated in the experimental section or written description offer no guidance or teachings as to how perform the process of making triazine of formula I with the given choices of variable groups and given choices of alcohols and amines as embraced in claim 21.

Art Unit: 1624

4. The presence or absence of working examples:

Although examples 1-2 show the process for making triazine carbamate of formula II, it is limited to the process transesterification with butanol. There is no showing the amine would also lead to carbamate bearing triazine.

5. The breadth of the claims:

Specification has no support, as noted above, for making compound of formula II reacting compound of formula II with various amines. There is no support the process generically embraced in the process of the claim would lead to desired compound of formula II.

6. The quantity of experimentation needed:

The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired structure, namely compound of formula II embraced in the instant claim 36.

Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

Thus, factors such as “sufficient working examples”, the “level of skill in the art and predictability, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the case for the instant claims.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, “A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).”

That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1624

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624